Case 3:99-cv-00%80HE0UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
OF YORTHUNDUSTRICT OF TEXAS
FILED

MAR -1 2000

ORDER STRIKING/UNFILING PLEADING

The Clerk, having identified a defect in the form of the document indicated below, and the Court Washing Macrosoft URT determined that the document should be stricken, it is ordered that the document be stricken from the record of this case. The Clerk is hereby directed to unfile and return this document to the party who filed it. NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY _____ Date: Case Number. 3:99-CV-680-BC Plaintiff: _____ Telephone Number: 🛚 🗟 Deputy Clerk: _ sonce to the Courts orders and motions for a conference and is considered deficient in the areas(s) noted below has been filed by 1. A civil cover sheet must be filed with the complaint. See LR 3.1(c). 2. The document(s) must be in proper form. See LR 10.1. 3. The signature of the attorney of record or the party proceeding pro se is required on each document filed. See F.R.C.P. 11. A completed certificate of service as defined in F.R.C.P. 5(d) is required. 4. 5. Each separate document contained therein must be identified. See LR 5.1(c). 6. The motion must include: certificate of conference or inability to confer. See LR 7.1(b). brief in support of motion. See LR 7.1(d) or LR 56.5(a). b. proposed order. See LR 7.1(c). C. documentary or non-documentary evidence in a separate appendix. See LR 7.1(i) or LR 56.6(a). 7. A motion for leave to amend must be accompanied by a copy of the proposed amended pleading attached as an exhibit and an original and second copy of the proposed pleading that is neither attached to the motion nor made an exhibit to the motion. See LR 15.1. A motion for continuance of a trial setting must be signed by the party as well 8. as by the attorney of record. See LR 40.1. 9. An attorney seeking pro hac vice admission must apply for admission on an approved form and pay a \$25.00 fee. See LR 83.9(b). 10. Additional copies are required. See LR 5.1(b). 11 The attorney filing the pleading is not admitted to practice in this district. See LR 83.7. use Wosed 12. Other

Pscument 107 Filed 03/01/02

Case 319 Adv-00680

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas Dallas Division

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

By

Deputy

Jamal Elhaj-Chehade plaintiff

Vs.

3:99-CV-0680 (D) BC

Educational Commission For Foreign Medical Graduates (entities and individuals) defendants

Plaintiff's responses to the courts orders and motions for a conference meeting between the parties and before judges, and motion leave to appeal before a USDC district judge

February 25, 2002

MAR - 1 2002

Comes now on this date, the plaintiff is filing his firm responses to the courts ruling as follow:

1-the lower court render motion for summary judgment was under the influence and premature and came before the scheduled meeting between the parties that was scheduled on Friday January 4th 2001(see court scheduled order by judge Boyle) assuming the plaintiff cannot prove his case.

2-the appeals court refused the appeal assuming the plaintiff claims as Frivolous, the plaintiff firmly denies the courts claims as frivolous, the defendants clearly admitted to every element of every claim brought against them in this case and in the new case, and that the court is under the influence which make any order and judgment void and null under the Exparte Communication or the alternative clause and under the supremacy of the US Constitution and international treaties over any order judgment or rules (including FRCP and local rules)

- 3- The defendants and the courts ignored the new evidences and developments in the case which indicate collaboration between the defendants and the judges
- 4-the defendants admitted to every claims and element in their income tax filings and publications and correspondences which constitute evidences admissible under the rules of evidences.
- 5- in addition, the plaintiff reaffirms his position that his consent before a magistrate judge was limited and conditional, and after the assurance from Mrs Schwartz the defendants attorney that magistrate judges cannot do final orders and judgment, they only write suggestions (during the scheduled meeting between the plaintiff and Mrs Schwartz In George Allen Building Courthouse at 600 commerce street at the Second floor in Dallas, as ordered by the court on February 2000 for the purpose of consent before a Magistrate)the plaintiff did not waive his rights for a jury, nor waive his right to appeal before a district judge, and that the summary judgement and orders are inappropriate absent the jury and rendering order by a district judge without the appeal. Therefore all

106